THE

HERALD OF TRUTH.

And HE that sat upon the throne said, "BEHOLD I MAKE ALL THINGS NEW." Rev. xxi. 5

VOL. I. MARCH 9, 1826. No. 22.

FOR THE HERALD OF TRUTH.

—

Steubenville, January 27th, 1826.

Mr. Editor—

I transmit to you a copy of a correspondence between Mrs. C. M. Thayer and myself, which a consideration for her situation and respect for her sex induced me to suppress until now, as I calculated that good policy if no other consideration would have induced Mrs. Thayer to rest satisfied with the publication of her last recantation; but as it appears that she still continues attempting to asperse and stigmatize the new dispensation, and perhaps encouraged by our forbearance, and also as your correspondent does not continue his strictures, I submit to your consideration the following letter to publish or suppress as your better judgment may suggest. I have only to observe that I have no other inducement than the necessity of repelling her calumnies, as it appears the Methodist church throughout this state at least, are much satisfied and elevated thereby, and many imposed upon by her falsification of the doctrines. I am with respect, your

Brother in the truth.
WILLIAM GRANT.

—

Dear Madam—

As it was not in a spirit of controversy, nor that I considered you accountable to any earthly tribunal or individual that I wrote to you, but to ascertain whether the *report* of your *reunion* with the Methodist church was true; and had you confined yourself to that information I should not have again addressed you. But as you attempt self-justification by what appears to me injustice to the writings of Emanuel Sweden-

borg and their adherents, I cannot consistent with my duty to both, avoid a reply to that part of your communication which relates to our church. You say that, "*you are mistaken in supposing me to have had an adequate knowledge of the New Church doctrines, when I wrote the letter alluded to in yours, which is now before me. I had then read the works of Clowe's Hindmarsh's Seal, &c. and one volume of the Arcana of Emanuel Swedenborg.*"

Permit me to ask respecting what tenet of the New Dispensation have you lately discovered that you were then unacquainted with? You quote two volumes at least of the Arcana, one of which viz: the fifth you cite. Also from both volumes of the Christian Religion which you cite. You also say "*subsequent experience has convinced me that I had very imperfect views of the claim of Emanuel Swedenborg as an inspired teacher.*"

What claim of the author to inspiration have you now discovered that is not contained in every volume of the Arcana and true Christian Religion? You further add "*I began to doubt seriously whether that could be the true light which produced such palpable obscurity. Nevertheless I went on reading to confirm my present views rather then to elucidate truth and daily declining in vital piety.*" Can a cause produce an opposite effect! I am not surprised Madam that you should decline in *vital piety*, when your researches were not to elucidate truths but to confirm your present opinion which appears by your own words not to be in the *truth*. Be this as it may, certain it is, that you cannot charge the heavenly doctrines with your decay of vital piety consistent with your own expression in your letter to the Methodist Church as follows, "But I could not conceive that to have a higher reverence for the holy scripures and a deeper admiration for the Divine Redeemer would unfit me for the discharge of any christian duty." And again, we believe in the absolute necessity of *Regeneration* and life, according to the commandments of God, in order to enjoy the blessedness of heaven." And I may add if the regenerate state, and a life according to the commandments, be a decay of *vital piety*; I must confess I know not the meaning of the word piety. You also add, "*On a free and candid examination of our opinions I did find that difference of sentiment which I had anticipated, and what difference did exist we mutually resolved to waive. I am now united to the church in doctrine, &c.*" (Remark,) I must acknowledge I cannot understand your union in doctrine with those whom you are constrained mutually to waive your difference of opinion. You also say, "*that I was enabled to advocate with success the doctrines of the Supreme divinity of Jesus Christ in opposition to a sentiment not contained in the creed of the Methodist church.*" (Remark,) Not the supreme only, but the exclusive divinity of the Saviour for which you now substitute the words supreme and real divinity as being less opposed to your present notion of the atonement, since, to use your own words, if Jesus be God could he atone to himself, (C. M. Thayer's letter to the Methodist Church,) and also I wish to know wherein Mr. Roy has been

inconsistent with the Methodist creed? Whatever may be the opinions of those with whom you waived your difference, and who have removed your doubts, Mr. Roy is consistent with the creed of his church whatever the gentleman you allude to may urge to the contrary. You further say, "I now see no inconsistency in the commonly received views of the atonement as connected with the unity of God." Here I would again remark, if the indivisible divine essence can exist in three distinct subjects there can be no inconsistency, but it must ever be inconsistent with the exclusive divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and also that a finite being committed an infinite offence and the finite principle which our Lord assumed, could make an infinite atonement neither the word supports nor enlightened reason can receive, and it will not be presumed that the Lord in his infinity could suffer by men and devils. And from your pen (in a letter to Mr. Roy) "many others have suffered more excruciating pain than did the finite nature which our Lord assumed from the mother Mary." You object to the term persons, and so do I, if not qualified, and I would ask what qualification can we give the term persons in the Godhead which we can reconcile to the exclusive divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ? Does he exist in three persons in any sense proper to the term? I object therefore to the term applied in the plural, as terms are formed to convey ideas if not a right idea they will convey a wrong one, for it will not avail to deny three divine beings by saying that there are three subsistencies, as subsistence is existence and therefore if there are three subsistencies there must be three existences which are three distinct divine beings at last. (You say in your letter to Mr. Roy) as follows, "By the word persons I mean a being possessing distinct individuality; and if this definition be correct it seems to me to be wholly incompatible with the whole tenor of the sacred scriptures to believe that there are three persons in the Godhead. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve." "The Lord thy God is one Lord." "I am God and there is none else." And you further add "these are the words of divine inspiration and quotations of the same import may be taken from every part of the word." But in your letter to me you say, "Much of the force of any argument I can adduce from the scriptures will I am aware be lost upon you from this circumstance, that you do not esteem the writings of the apostles as of equal authority with other parts of the Bible, and if I quote the plain obvious meaning of that which you allow to be the word of God, you will probably find that by correspondencies it has quite another meaning."

I must acknowledge this is an ingenious pretext to avoid citing the word since the word cannot now support what it formerly denied, nor vice versa. But where has Emanuel Swedenborg, or any writer or individual of the New Church rejected any passage in the Apostolick writings? For though they have not the internal sense, we cite them for doctrine and practice, and as the Old Church deny a threefold sense in the word we therefore give as much authority to that part of it

which you say we reject as you do in your present faith to any part thereof; and also let me ask where Emanuel Swedenborg or any writer of our church has appealed to the spiritual sense of the word for doctrine? On the contrary, does he not say that doctrine must be taken from and proven by the letter of the word? Nay did you spiritualize the word in your controversy with Roy and letter to the Methodist Church? Certainly not, nor shall I, of which you must certainly be well aware. You further add in your letter to me "I endeavored to make a distinction between inspiration and illumination but have failed in the attempt and have been constrained however specious may be the theories of Emanuel Swedenborg, to reject his testimony for want of collateral evidence." Here I must inform you that neither our author nor his adherents make a distinction between illumination and inspiration; Emanuel Swedenborg says the spirit of a man is his mind, the elevation of which is illumination or inspiration whichever you may choose to call it. But it is unaccountable that you should consider these writings which you once received, as mere theory; are they not also practical? And therefore permit me humbly to entreat you for your own sake not to attempt to impute your decay of vital piety when a member of our church, to the doctrine thereof, nor to stigmatize the author which you once esteemed. In the language of the Poet:

I loved her, beautiful and kind,
And plighted loves eternal vow;
So altered are her face and mind
Twere perjury to love her now.

But if you do not still admire her as a mistress, you ought to respect her as an old friend. To use your own words "be careful then that you cast no undeserved censure on that of Emanuel Swedenborg, or aid in the circulation of the slanders his enemies have devised." As for want of collateral evidence, of which you now complain, let your pen bear testimony, (see Mrs. Thayer's letter to the Methodist Church as follows,) "For seven years discarding all systems but the revealed word of God, I have acknowledged the Lord Jesus Christ in his divine humanity as the only proper object of christian worship." On the exclusive divinity from your own pen, we also find as follows.—"We do not confine ourselves for proofs to any particular chapter or part of the sacred writings; we perceive in the whole tenor of the scriptures a demonstration of this grand truth. We see therefore insuperable difficulties in admitting that there are three persons in the Godhead, because persons implies distinct identity and the doctrine of distinct identities forces upon us the absurd proposition that there are three Gods. And now suffer me to ask, what is there so repugnant to christianity in the doctrines of the New Church? I am convinced of the fact, by the unerring testimony of revelation. We can still appeal to an unerring counsellor, the holy scriptures. The word of God is my only rule and it is because I think the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg conformable to that word that I prize them next my bible. But

even then I must adhere to the unity of God and the exclusive divinity of the Lord Jesus, because they rest not on the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg alone, but on the testimony of Moses and the prophets." Here I would remark as to your being further from the worship of the unknown God now than when you worshipped the Lord Jesus Christ alone in his divine humanity, let your present creed and the word of God bear witness. 1st. What can be predicated of personality in the Godhead, if God has neither body or parts. 2d. That in every manifestation and representation of the Lord mentioned in his word, he is described in human form, particularly in that he ascended from the grave into heaven with his body complete. 3d. That the Word throughout declares there is but one God, and therefore if Jesus Christ is not the only God, he can be no God at all; if he is the only God he does not consist of three but one person. In short those who choose may worship the unknown God without body or parts, but I cannot do it. For the God of the New Jerusalem is the Lord in his divine humanity, and *in him dwells all the fullness of the godhead bodily.* "*The only wise God our Saviour*," as there is no substance or essence without form nor vice versa. You say, "We have wronged the Protestant church when we have supposed her doctrines of atonement to imply an implacable disposition in the father of the Universe." But I would ask in what way can the death of Christ (considered as a sacrifice or expiation) be conceived to operate to the remission of sins unless by appeasing him who otherwise would not have forgiven us." And also to use your own expression (letter to Roy) on the subject of the glorification which you now renounce for the present prevailing notion of the atonement as follows. "I have quoted four passages which are directly in point and hundreds more might be adduced; if we find it in the bible have we need to look any further?" See Matth. "The offering of Christ once on the cross is a full and perfect satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world both actual and original, and there is no other satisfaction for sin." If this be true it excludes the necessity of repentance, regeneration and a life according to the commandments, (also "Shin on salvation) that the evidence of truth is intuitive. If this be so, none can err, for truth can have no higher evidence than itself. (Again Shin on salvation,) "that it was not to satisfy divine justice, the Lord suffered, but to make it just in the Father to forgive sinners." Is not this a palpable contradiction? [Shin] "That it was to shew the detestation of the father to sin that our Lord suffered." But I would ask, would not the law answer a better purpose for this than the gospel. The punishment of Korah and his company, and the many exemplary punishments of the Jewish nation are calculated to shew more the detestation of the Father to sin than the punishment of his Son the only righteous one. And now let me ask whether that doctrine which teaches the imputation of the life of man, or that which teaches the imputation of the death and sufferings of another in our stead is best calculated to inculcate the necessity of a life of holiness

without which no one can see God. And now that the Lord in his mercy may elevate you into the true illumination, is the sincere praver of your friend. WILLIAM GRANT.

P. S. For though the recipients of the new dispensation do not dread an angry God or material hell, (J. Wesly, says if there be any fire in hell it must be material) yet as state constitutes place and not vice versa, we need to take heed what manner of men we be " for to be carnally minded is death and to be spiritually minded is life and peace." Rest assured Madam, that it is not from self gratification or retaliation that I have addressed the foregoing to you. But in respect, sympathy, and christian affection, that you may compare, consider and weigh the contents of a subject so highly interesting to yourself. You are well aware that no recipient of the new dispensation receives the doctrines on any authority but the word, and that we believe in the inspiration of Emanuel Swedenborg, from the doctrines being the clearest stream of the fountain. When you refute your former arguments in favor of the New Dispensation with the same energy of scriptural and rational evidence, with that with which you have maintained them, then and not till then will you be able to convince rational minds and impartial readers, that you have now renounced error for truth. I truly regret the necessity of being thus explicit to which a love for the truth compels me. But however you may change your sentiments, I hope you will not attempt to confound truth and error (as you know the consequence) or in other words, that you will not put the new piece to the old garment least the rent be made worse. But that you and I may by divine mercy endeavor to put new wine into new bottles that both may be preserved.

To the above correspondence I subjoin the following extracts taken from Mrs. C. M. Thayer's letter to the Methodist Church, wherein she observes " that the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, discovers the absolute necessity of purification from all evils of heart and life and opens to the devout mind inexhaustable treasures of heavenly wisdom," page 15 And again, " but weak and erring as I am, should the propensities of fallen nature prevail and draw me into errors of life, say not that the principles I profess are impure but that they have not had the due effect on any heart and affections," page 21. Now let me ask how can Mrs. C. M. Thayer be guilty of that which she so solemnly warns others against? viz: if imputing her decay of piety when a member of our church to the doctrines thereof, she being so amply convinced of their contrary tendency.

ON THE WRITINGS OF THE APOSTLES, BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG.

With regard to the writings of St. Paul, and the other apostles, I have not given them a place in my *Arcana Cœlestia*, because they are dogmatic writings merely, and not written in the style of *the Word*, as those of the prophets, of David, of the Evangelists, and the revelation of St. John.

The style of the Word consists throughout in *correspondencies*, and thence effects an immediate communication with heaven; but the style of these dogmatic writings is quite different, having indeed communication with heaven but only mediate or indirectly.

The reason why the apostles wrote in this style, was, that the New Christian Church was then to begin through them, consequently the same style as is used in *the Word* would not have been proper for such doctrinal tenets, which required plain and simple language, suited to the capacities of all readers.

Nevertheless the writings of the apostles are very good books for the church, inasmuch as they insist on the doctrine of charity and faith thence derived as strongly as the Lord himself has done in the Gospels, and in the Revelation of St. John, as will appear evidently to any one who studies these writings with attention. In the Apocalypse Revealed I have proved, No. 417, that the words of Paul in Rom. iii. 28. are quite misunderstood; and thus the doctrine of justification by faith alone, which at present constitutes the theology of the reformed churches, is built on an entirely false foundation.

OF ILLUSTRATION FROM THE WORD.

Those who are in externals, without internals, cannot be illustrated or confirmed in truths; but those who are in externals, and at the same time in internals, when they read the Word are illustrated, and see truths in illustration, in which they are afterwards more and more confirmed; and what is wonderful, to every one there is such illustration as is the affection of truth, and such affection of truth as there is good of life; from hence it is also, that those who are in no affection of truth on account of truth, but on account of gain, are not enlightened when they read the Word, but are only confirmed in doctrinals; for they do not seek the kingdom of the Lord, but the world; not faith but fame; thus not heavenly, but earthly riches. *Arc.* 7012.

OF FRIENDSHIP IN ANOTHER LIFE.

In another life, all friendship and all brotherhood, which was grounded merely in the external man, is obliterated with both parties, and the brotherhood and friendship of the internal man only remain:—in another life affection consociates.—*Arc.* 4121.

Homogeneous affection causes conjunction, and heterogeneous affection causeth separation; therefore spirits are separated, according to the diversities, varieties, and differences of the affections that constitute the state of their love.—*Theo.* 622.

Heaven is arranged into innumerable societies, all connected with each other according to the differences of the affections, which are of love in general, and in particular; each society is one species of affection, and there they dwell distinctly, according to the propinquities and affinities of that species of affection; and they who are in the nearest state of propinquity in the same house.—*Apoc.* 883.

Sympathies and antipathies are nothing else but exhalations of affections from minds, which create delight in another according to their similitudes, and excite aversion according to their dissimilitudes or differences; these, not withstanding they are innumerable, and are imperceptible to any bodily sense, are yet perceivable by the mental senses, as one single affection, and according thereto, all conjunctions and consociations in the spiritual world are regulated.—*Theo.* 365.

OF THE INTERNAL WORD

The Lord's rising again on the third day, implies also that truth divine, or the word as to the internal sense, as it was understood by the ancient church, shall be raised again in the consummation of the age, which also is the third day; wherefore it is said, that then shall appear the Son of Man, that is Truth Divine.—*Arc.* 2813.

To the end that the Lord might be constantly present, he revealed the spiritual sense of his word, in which sense truth divine is in its light, and in this light he is continually present, for his presence in the Word, is only by means of the spiritual sense, through the light whereof he passes into a shade, in which is the sense of the letter, comparatively as the light of the sun doth in the day-time by the interposition of a cloud.—*Theo.* 700.

The internal sense is such, that all and every thing concerned therein is to be understood abstractedly from the letter, and just as if the letter was not, for in the internal sense is the soul and life of the

Word, which doth not appear unless the sense of the letter is as it were evanescent; thus the angels by influx from the Lord perceive the Word when it is read by man.—*Theo.* 290.

They who are in divine ideas, never respect the word of the Lord from the letter, but consider the letter and the literal sense as representative and significative of the celestial and spiritual things appertaining to the church, and to the Lord's kingdom, and only as an instrumental means of leading the thoughts to such spiritual and celestial objects.—*Arc.* 1807.

Of Temptations.

A son of twenty years and upwards as mentioned in Numbers, chap. 1. verse 20, and in various other places, signifies those who are at an age to war against evils and falses, and are consequently called forth so to do; for the good of infancy is insinuated from the nativity to the tenth year of man's age, the good of ignorance from the tenth to the twentieth. From this year man begins to become rational, and to have the faculty of reflecting on good and truth, and to procure to himself the good of intelligence. Before the age of twenty man does not come into temptation, being before that period only in the good of ignorance, and it is of the Divine Providence that no one is tempted before he is capable of reflecting, and of perceiving in his particular manner and measure what is good and true.—*Arc.* 2280.

The reason why temptations have heretofore remained unknown, and that scarce any one hath been acquainted with their nature and origin, and what good they are productive of, is, because the church heretofore hath not been in possession and under the influence of the truths, as no one can be unless he approacheth the Lord immediately, and rejecteth the former faith and embraceth the new; this is the true cause why not a single person grounded in a perverse and vain faith hath been admitted into any spiritual temptation, since the time when the council of Nice introduced the faith of three Gods; for had he been admitted, he would instantly have fallen under it, and thereby would have plunged himself deeper into hell.—The contrition which is said to precede the above faith is not temptation; with simple minds it may possibly be attended with a timorous apprehension about hell-fire.—*Theo.* 597.

The internal man is reformed by means of truths, for it is by truth he seeth what is evil and false, which still abideth in the external or natural man; of consequence there now first commenceth a disagreement between the new will which is above, and the old will which is below, and this disagreement between the two wills, is attended also with a disagreement between the respective delights of each; the flesh with its concupiscences ought first to be subdued, before the spirit can exert itself and become a new man; after this disagreement

of the two wills, there commenceth a combat which is called spiritual temptation; man feeleth this combat as in himself, and like a sting of conscience, nevertheless it is the Lord and the Devil, that is hell, which fight in man and contend for dominion over him, or for the possession of him; the devil or hell assaulteth man and calleth forth his evils, while the Lord defendeth him, and calleth forth his goods. Man ought to fight as of himself, inasmuch as he enjoyeth freedom of will, to act either in favor of the Lord, if he abideth in truth from a principle of goodness, or in favour of the devil, if he abideth in falses from a principle of evil.—*Theo.* 596.

By temptations a check is given to self-love and the love of the world, from whence all sorts of evils and falsities are derived. *Arc.* 5356.

Hereby man is reduced to a state of humiliation.—*Arc.* 8966.

Man is hereby taught in what goodness and truth do consist, even from relation to their opposites.—*Arc.* 6356.

After temptations there is an immense increase of truths in the soul.—*Arc.* 5663.

The members of the church spiritual are tempted with regard to the truths of faith, wherefore they carry on the combat by means of truths, but the members of the church celestial are tempted with regard to the good things of love, wherefore these good things are their instruments of combat.—*Arc.* 1668.

Temptation is of no avail, and productive of no good, unless a man believeth, when the temptation is passed, that the Lord hath fought and conquered for him.—*Arc.* 8969.

In temptations man imagineth that the Lord is absent, because his prayers do not seem to be attended to, as when he is out of temptations; but nevertheless the Lord is then more intimately present with him.—*Arc.* 840.

After temptations the Lord reduceth goodness and truths in man to a new order, and disposeth them according to a celestial form.—*Arc.* 10685.

FOR THE HERALD OF TRUTH.

Mr. Editor,

I am an old man and have witnessed a great variety of changes in the course of my life, most of which I could rationally and satisfactorily account for. But there is one great change which I have noticed for many years past which it is more difficult to understand; it seemed to come on at first very slowly, but every year of late it increases more rapidly, and takes a broader sweep. This change is not

so much in the world of matter as in the world of mind. A great part of mankind seem to possess a mental freedom, or freedom of mind, heretofore unknown. It extends even to some old people, and I can say for one, that I feel a very sensible change in this respect in myself. Fifty years ago I did not dare to think at all for myself, particularly on religious subjects, and I felt in duty bound to ask the Minister of the Parish where I then lived, what I might think and what I might say. But now I am astonished at the change I feel. I regard no more what the Parson says than what any other man says, unless he gives better reasons for it. And though I respect the priestly office more than I ever did, I do not respect the man any further than his life and instructions comport with that office. And I find Mr. Editor that I am not alone, there are others who think as I do, and many more would do so, if they had a little more independence of mind. But they are seeking for worldly riches or honours, and they will externally unite in sentiment with those who are most popular, and who will be most likely to advance their interests. And as the recommendation or friendship of an established clergyman is often of great use, they will endeavor by cringing, and bowing and pretending to think as he does, to obtain his approbation. And as the Parson's design is often as external and selfish as his sycophantic admirer, he cares nothing about the sincerity of the man, for he gains his object, and thus each becomes the other's tool. Now I have no hesitation Mr. Editor, in saying that I believe there is a great deal of this kind of religion in the United States.

But to return to my more immediate subject, which is that of mental freedom, and it seems indeed as if children at the present day inherit it as a birthright. For children cannot be governed now, as they were when I was a boy. Go into any family you please, or into any school you please, and you will find abundant proof of the truth of this remark.

Now what I wish to arrive at, is the cause of all this, and also what will be its final result. I am not satisfied when told that mankind are becoming more enlightened, and that useful knowledge is more generally diffused than heretofore, and that this is the reason. For I discover this freedom in minds which are destitute of this knowledge, not only in children, in private families, and in schools, but in apprentice boys, and in many very ignorant persons of riper years. And on the other hand, I see some persons who have enjoyed first rate advantages for the acquisition of knowledge and who certainly on most subjects possess it, and yet they neither enjoy or feel the liberty of which I have been speaking, but their minds are chained down in slavish bondage which they cannot or dare not resist.

Now Mr. Editor if this subject should so far interest your attention, or that of some of your correspondents as to elicit an explanation, I shall be much gratified. ANNOSUS.

FOR THE HERALD OF TRUTH.

Mr. Editor—

There are so many mysterious things in the Sacred Scriptures, that common or old church Theologians do not explain at all, or so unsatisfactorily explain, that many moral characters and men of sound and discriminating judgment are almost driven to scepticism or infidelity. Now sir, I cannot but think that there are many persons of this description, who would embrace christianity with all their hearts if they could only see and know that it is a consistent and rational thing. And I have no doubt but those very passages of scripture which now are the cause of stumbling, would afford them much delight and instruction if they could only be made acquainted with the internal or spiritual sense. Suffer me then to bring forward the following passages of the above description, requesting yourself or some of your correspondents to give them an explanation. As first, Joshua x. 12, 13. "*Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of the Lord, Sun stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou Moon in the valley of Ajalon.*" "*And the Sun stood still and the Moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? So the Sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.*" Secondly, Jonah, i. 17. "*Now the Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah. And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights.*" Thirdly, Jonah iv, 6, 7. "*And the Lord God, prepared a gourd, and made it to come up over Jonah, that it might be a shadow over his head to deliver him from his grief. So Jonah was exceeding glad of the gourd. But God prepared a worm when the morning rose the next day, and it smote the gourd that it withered.*"

G. W. C.

ANSWER TO G W. C'S COMMUNICATION PUBLISHED IN THE HERALD OF TRUTH, NO. 17, PAGE 319.

Concerning the genealogy of Jesus Christ.

If the genealogies of our Saviour given in Matthew and Luke have only a literal meaning, one or the other, or both must be very inaccurate, for they can never be made to harmonize. The circumstance that Matthew declares Joseph to be the son of Jacob, while Luke calls him the son of Heli, is indeed a difficulty, but by no means the only one, or the greatest. And those who deny and reject the internal sense of the word will never be able to reconcile this difficulty or any of the others. And even if they could, no particular advantage would be derived from them, for these genealogies do not even literally teach us the lineage of our Saviour. They would indeed give us the descent of Joseph, but Joseph was not the father of the child Jesus.

In comparing these two accounts together, we find them different, not only in the instance mentioned by our correspondent, but in many others. From Abraham to David inclusive, Matthew traces a lineage of forty names, but Luke fifty five, and they disagree in nearly all except the first fourteen, that is from Abraham to David. After which Matthew descends in his account through Solomon and his posterity, but Luke through Nathan and his posterity, and they agree no more until they meet in the person of Joseph the husband of Mary. I know that the common mode of getting over this difficulty, is by supposing that one account relates to Joseph and the other to Mary, but though this may silence the superficial enquirer, it will by no means satisfy any one earnestly seeking for truth. And it is at most, a mere supposition, without even a shadow of proof. For Jacob and Heli are both declared to be the father of Joseph, and neither the one or the other is mentioned in the word as the father of Mary, the wife of Joseph. But my only motive in mentioning these difficulties is to induce the reader to turn his attention from the literal sense of the word where there are many difficulties to the spiritual sense where there are none. It appears to me very plain that both Matthew and Luke intended to convey a meaning beyond the literal sense. Matthew calls his account "*The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham:* And Luke says, "*Who was the son of Adam who was the son of God.*" The mere assertion of any man, that the Bible has a spiritual meaning, or that the names mentioned therein represent spiritual principles, is no proof, but if we find these names are used in the Bible itself, in such a manner as cannot be literally understood, reason itself, ought to teach us that there must be a spiritual meaning. That some names are used in this manner I shall now attempt to show, as in Ezekiel, xxxiv. 23, 24. "*I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David: he shall feed them, and he shall be their Shepherd.*" "*And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them, I the Lord have spoken it.*" Also chapter xxxvii. 25 "*And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt, and they shall dwell therein, even they and their children and their children's children forever, and my servant David shall be their prince forever.*"

By David in these passages cannot literally be meant King David, the son of Jesse and the father of Solomon, for he had long been dead, and this David was to be a prince forever in the land which the Lord had given to Jacob. But it is plain that no prince can reign forever in this world, for it is appointed unto all men once to die." And those who believe *only* in the literal sense of the word will find another difficulty, for they think that this material world is to be destroyed by fire; if so, I would ask them what is to become of the land which was given to Jacob, the very land where these people were to dwell forever, and where David was to be prince over them for ever. Let prejudice and tradition be set aside, and let reason and revelation have their due

weight, and we shall soon find that all the excellence and importance of these passages must be spiritual. For one part cannot be taken spiritually and all the rest literally. And as David was to be the prince forever, it cannot mean king David, who had long been dead. David therefore must have some other meaning, and so must Jacob, and so must the people, and so must the land where they were to dwell forever.

It has generally been believed that David in some way or other represented the Lord. This is well, for it is one step towards understanding the word spiritually. David does indeed represent the Lord, for David in the word corresponds to DIVINE TRUTH. And the Lord said "*I am the way, the* TRUTH *and the life.* The sovereignty or kingly authority of David represents the POWER OF DIVINE TRUTH.

[*To be Continued.*]

FOR THE HERALD OF TRUTH.

Mr. Editor—

Observing a singular communication under the signature of Horatio in No. xx. of the Herald of Truth, page 361, I have written the following short reply, and now send it for your consideration, either to publish or not, as you may think best. AMOR VERITATIS.

TO HORATIO.

I could hardly have believed that you were serious in the many questions which you have proposed, were it not that in conversation I have several times heard some of the same interrogatories and others very similar, and from persons, who I know considered them important. Your main question would amount to this: if the New Church is the true church, why does it not increase as fast as other churches, especially as those which are co temporary. To this I should reply, that the truth or falsity of any principle ought not to be determined by the number of its votaries whether that number be great or small. But were I to admit this as a rule for judging, my conclusion would be the reverse of yours. For in all ages of the world of which we know any thing, there have always been much greater numbers on the side of error, than on the side of truth. The Heathen are more numerous than the christians, and the worshippers of idols more numerous than the worshippers of the true and living God. Mankind are very selfish beings, and they manifest this love of self as much in their choice of religion as any thing else, and that creed which will assist them the most in the acquisition of worldly riches or honours, is almost certain to be considered as the best. I do not pretend that all act upon this principle, for I am confident that some do not, but that many

do, I have no hesitation in saying that I firmly believe. But it is probable that the most of those are not fully sensible of their own motives, "*for the heart of man is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked.*" You have justly observed "that it requires pretty good courage to attend the meetings of the New Church," because prejudice is so strong against it. This is at once giving the reason why people of the above description would be certain to keep aloof. There are but two ways by which any principle can reach the human mind; one is through the medium of the affections, and the other through the medium of the understanding. All who embrace any religious system through fear, prejudice, tradition, or party spirit, receive it through the affections, and the understanding has little or nothing to do with it. Here let us take a view of the religious world and see if the people generally understand the doctrines which they profess, and I presume that ninety-nine out of a hundred do not, and many will acknowledge it, but some will not, but their attempted explanations plainly show what they are not willing to admit, and this opinion extends to the clergy as well as others. Most people appear to have too much mental indolence to be willing closely and carefully to investigate any system of religion. They had rather take it upon trust, as it relates to a future world, for it seems enough for them to examine into the concerns of this. The blindfold religion of the passions is sometimes of use, particularly by way of restraint, but it can never give the necessary knowledge of ourselves, of the character of God, or of the nature of true devotion. This at once accounts for the heterogeneous mixture of good and evil in the characters of many professors.

We are in duty bound to do the will of our heavenly father, but this cannot be done, unless we have a knowledge of that will, and knowledge belongs to the understanding. The religion of the New Church is addressed to the understanding and through that operates upon the affections, nor is its work completed until every evil in the affections is subdued. Thus heavenly truth, unmixed with error, dwells in the understanding, is ardently loved by the affections, and by their united operation is manifested in life and action. True religion descends from heaven, and of course reaches like the ladder of Jacob from heaven to earth, we must not be satisfied with the lower part of it, that part which touches the ground, but we must rise upon it, and continue to rise, or we shall never reach the upper part which alone can introduce us to the happiness of heaven. Every step that we rise we shall discover a higher degree of divine wisdom as well as of divine love. We shall constantly find abundant use for all the powers and faculties we possess, and for all the knowledges that we can acquire. Ignorance in religion, is spiritual darkness, and he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.

It is objected to the New Church that it requires too much study, too much investigation; but this ought to be considered as an argument in its favour, for a system of religion that can be fully comprehended

at once by a weak and wicked man must be low and mean indeed.—But many are deterred from the examination of the New Jerusalem verities because they are told that it requires much time to understand them. Thus Sir, the slow progress of the New Church may be easily accounted for. The prejudice which generally prevails against it, many are afraid to encounter; the mistaken opinion, that it is very difficult if not impossible to understand it, operates strongly upon the minds of many. To which may be added the misrepresentation by which many well meaning people are induced to consider it as phantasy, jargon and nonsense—also the prepossession or traditional prejudice which most people feel for the particular religion in which they were educated, and the consequent aversion to every other—the external and superficial ideas that very many have imbibed concerning the nature or object of religion, and the dislike which they feel towards any thing internal or spiritual, and in many instances it is to be feared a total disbelief thereof—and also the common propensity of deciding and condemning without evidence or knowledge. If you divide mankind into two great classes, to wit, professors of religion and non-professors, it will assist you in forming a judgment on this subject. Amongst those of the former class you will find nearly all so well satisfied with their respective systems, and so bigotted against every other, that they cannot be induced carefully to examine any thing new.—Amongst those of the latter class, you will find nearly all so completely engaged in the concerns of this world, and so totally indifferent about, or so opposed to all religion or the concerns of another life, that they cannot be led to the examination of any system of religion, whether it be new or old. But there are a few, comparatively very few,---here and there one, both amongst professors and non-professors, who wish and endeavor to understand what they profess to believe. Those of this description amongst professors of all denominations of the Old Church, as soon as they begin intellectually to examine their respective systems, begin also to find insurmountable difficulties, contradictions and absurdities, and are thereby led to look somewhere else, for something better, and more consistent. Those non-professors who possess ingenuous and discriminating minds and who are honestly seeking for truth, feeling the necessity of something on which they can rest for spiritual light and comfort, find themselves altogether unable after a careful investigation to embrace any of the common systems. Both these classes on the presentation of the heavenly doctrines of the New Jerusalem are certain to embrace them, and with such whether among the clergy or the laity the result will always be the same. But there is no other kind of people on earth whose minds it is possible to arrive at, excepting through the medium of the passions, and the doctrines of the New Jerusalem are never addressed to the passions, but always to the understanding, thus you may easily see why it is that so few embrace them. [*To be Continued.*]